UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,393	10/26/2001	Joel S. Hochman	Athena1	9804

30996 7590 12/02/2008

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 HIGHWAY 333
SUITE B
TIJERAS, NM 87059-7507

EXAMINER	
HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3736	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/007,393	**Applicant(s)** HOCHMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	**Art Unit** 3736	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires *6* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *32-37,41-43,46,47 and 73-79*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *1,12,13,20-31,38-40,44,45 and 80-87*.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Max Hindenburg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736

/Jeffrey G Hoekstra/
Examiner, Art Unit 3736

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The amendments filed 11/19/08 are merely a clean version of the pending claims and would remain rejected as set forth in the Final Rejection mailed 08/14/08.

Continuation of 13. Other:

The Examiner notes the Advisory Action mailed 11/19/08 is hereby VACATED in view of the amendments comprising a clean version of the claims and arguments filed 11/19/08 correcting Applicants previous submission on 11/06/08.

The request for reconsideration does not place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner maintains the rejection as set forth and cited in the Final Rejection, and in response to Applicant's arguments the Examiner notes the following:

In response to Applicant's arguments that Hochman in view of Guice does not disclose, teach, and/or fairly suggest the "two-way communication means with antenna and adapted to both transmit signals to a controller unit and receive signals from said controller unit wirelessly and in real time" or the "two-way communication means of the controller unit for transmitting signals to the probe unit to alter the activity of its annular means", the Examiner disagrees and notes Guice discloses (paragraphs 114, 124, 143, 144) the use of spread-spectrum waveform data-streaming (similar to those in advanced CDMA cell phones and CPS data streams) for transmitting and receiving to and from wireless transceivers with antennas for simultaneous transmission/reception of data, including a portable programming unit for transmitting commands to implement changes in the performance of probe (paragraph 215). Moreover it appears applicant is relying heavily on the functional limitation of the communications means of the probe and of the controller as communicating "in real time", absent any special definition in the instant specification the limitation "in real time" is being given its broadest reasonable interpretation with regards to its plain meaning which may be generally defined as "occurring immediately". Guice discloses transceivers communicating with controllers immediately as cited above.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "communicating by both sending and receiving signals simultaneously in both directions") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that Hochman in view of Guice does not disclose, teach, and/or fairly suggest "dimensioned as to permit comfortable and repeated insertion into, removal from, and containment entirely within a mammal's vagina", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Hochman and Guice disclose devices structured and dimensioned for comfortable and repeated insertion into and containment entirely within a mammal's vagina. The Hochman device is structured and dimensioned for removal from the mammal's vagina and the Guice device is capable of being removed from the mammal's vagina.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "stimulating pelvic muscles and/or nerves in a mammal" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).